

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,079	10/23/2003	Osamu Igarashi	PA2609US	2219
22830 7590 01/17/2007 CARR & FERRELL LLP 2200 GENG ROAD			EXAMINER	
			LEVY, NEIL S	
PALO ALTO, CA 94303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1615	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAYS		01/17/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- 1. Claim1-16, drawn to resin product, classified in class 424, subclass 78.08
- Claim17-21, drawn to methods of using, classified in class 424, subclass
   409.
- III. Claim22-31, drawn to METHODS OF MAKING, classified in class 523, subclass 122
- IV. Claim32, drawn to SYSTEMS, classified in class 43, subclass 107.

Inventions I,IV and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case THEprocess of making can be used to make materially different products, such as candles

Inventions I,IV and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case THE products can be used in materially different processes, such as perfuming.

The group I I Methods do not require the steps of group III in order to provide a product for use.; alternative methods of manufacture such as extrusion may be employed.

Group I AND II are independent & patentably distinct as I does not require the system of II.

The Groups I –II have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, the search for any one group is not required for any other Group, and a search and examination of the entire application would place an undue burden on the Examiner, the present restriction requirement is proper for examination purposes.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: species of form: that of claim3, 4, 5

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution. on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1,2,6 are generic.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct

species of the claimed invention: species of shape, one of claims 7,9,10,11,16,

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single

disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if
no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-6,12-15.

Claims 1-21 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species: repellent component. The species are independent or distinct because each repellent is chemically & physically different, may not repel the same pest species & may not be compatible with the resin. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Because the above restriction/election requirement is complex, a telephone call

Application/Control Number: 10/693,079 Page 6

Art Unit: 1615

to applicant's agent to request an oral election was not made. See M.P.E.P. Sec, 8 1 2 . 0 1 .

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NEIL LEVY whose telephone number is 571-272-0619. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 7 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL WOODWARD can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1615